



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

meet with fewer obstructions than during its continuance, Colonel Brackett will, for the sake of the profession, write another "History of the United States Cavalry," which shall be more purely military in its nature, and for which his opportunities of observation as Colonel, Chief, and Inspector would eminently qualify him.

- 
- 11.—*History of Federal Government, from the Foundation of the Achaian League to the Disruption of the United States.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. Vol. I. *General Introduction. History of the Greek Federations.* London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1863. 8vo. pp. xl, 721.

CORDIALLY recognizing the excellences of the federal form of government, Mr. Freeman has undertaken a survey of all the experiments in this kind from the earliest recorded times to our own day. His book is alike conspicuous for learning and for candor, for critical skill and historic discernment. Entering upon a field interesting in itself and hitherto untrod, it deserves to be ranked in that class of truly original works to which its author justly assigns Mr. Finlay's histories of Greece under foreign domination.

We must be allowed to take exception to a single phrase on Mr. Freeman's title-page. It was, however, in no spirit of unkindness or of exultation that the words "to the disruption of the United States" were written. We doubt not that Mr. Freeman sincerely rejoices that he was mistaken in the anticipations which, as it appears from several passages in his book, he entertained of the success of the Southern insurgents.\* For the book itself, as friends of the federal system to which we are indebted for so much of our greatness in the past, and which has just surmounted so triumphantly the extremest perils by which the strength of any form of government was ever tested, we cannot but be grateful.

An introductory chapter on the "Characteristics of Federal Government as compared with other Political Systems" will be read with interest by political students in this country. We must, in passing, allude to an error into which all theorists, not Americans born and bred, are prone to fall. We give it in our author's words: "The federal tie

---

\* We quote one of these passages: "It is dangerous to try to prophesy, but one cannot help thinking that the United States and the Confederate States will have exchanged ambassadors before the year 1941, or even before the year 1869." (p. 118.) The dates were suggested by the duration of the struggles for Dutch and for American independence respectively.

is weak because it is artificial. It is hardly possible that a man can feel the same love for an ingenious political creation as he may feel either for a single great nation or for a single city-commonwealth. The Achaian League or the American Union can hardly call forth either that feeling of hereditary loyalty which attaches to kings descended from Alfred or Saint Lewis, or that burning patriotism which the Athenian or the Florentine felt for the city in which his whole political and personal being found its home. A federal union, in short, must depend for its permanence, not on the sentiment, but on the reason of its citizens." (pp. 113, 114.) The fallacy lies in assuming that a federal union is necessarily a league between really distinct communities, of different history and modes of thinking, and forgetting that it may exist in a country whose people, like those of the United States, are substantially one in origin, traditions, interests, and feeling. The relations between the national government and the different States, and the powers of each, are defined in our Constitution with consummate wisdom; but the tie which binds the States together, so far from being "artificial," exists from the very nature of things. That it is not "weak," the world has just had evidence. The relation in feeling between old and long independent communities, like Argos, Corinth, and Sicyon, and the Achaian League, is vastly less close and intimate than that between the American States and the national government. We may be proud of our citizenship in Massachusetts, or Kentucky, or New York, just as a man might pride himself on his citizenship of London, or membership of the venerable academic community of Oxford; but as the pride of the London citizen or the Oxford scholar is subordinate to his pride as an Englishman, so is our local pride, however intense, lost in our larger pride as Americans. No majority of the people of this country was ever tainted with the heresy which asserts that one's allegiance to his State is paramount to his allegiance to the nation; and the war has silenced that heresy forever. Nearly two thirds of our States have no traditions behind the Union. American ideas, American institutions, the glory of American triumphs in peace and war, the bright hopes of American greatness in the future, occupy the hearts of our citizens in every quarter of the land, and, rising immeasurably above local attachments and prejudices, unite us in patriotic devotion to our country, as single, as definite, as intense as any with which ever Briton or Frenchman was fired.

Mr. Freeman devotes the larger part of his first volume to the Achaian League, having selected it as one of the "four federal commonwealths, in four different ages of the world," which "command, above all others, the attention of students of political history." The

three others are the Confederation of the Swiss Cantons, the Seven United Provinces of the Netherlands, and the United States of America, — an illustrious list, which the name of Achaia is not unworthy to begin.

Greece, for all ages the instructress of the world, rehearsed all the forms of government which were destined to be exhibited on the broader stage of after history. Even our own Federal Constitution, the most original and the most masterly political invention of modern times, finds its prototype in Achaia. Not that the features of our scheme were borrowed or imitated from the Greek original. On the contrary, they were the natural outgrowth of our inherited political principles, our colonial history, and our united struggle for independence, enforced by geographical position, and defined by the various necessities of our situation as understood and interpreted by men of rare insight, sagacity, and wisdom. Of the details of the Achaian constitution, the fathers of our republic had but scanty and imperfect knowledge; and it is amusing to see the inaccuracy of the accounts of it given by the standard historical authorities of that day. In the eighteenth number of the *Federalist*, Hamilton says, in words which Mr. Freeman aptly cites on his title-page, "Could the interior structure and regular operation of the Achaian League be ascertained, it is probable that more light might be thrown by it on the science of federal government, than by any of the like experiments with which we are acquainted"; and recent scholarship, in giving us the full picture of the Greek federation, and in exhibiting its many points of likeness to the American Republic, has but confirmed the sagacity of the founders of each commonwealth by the example of the other. We shall briefly describe, under our author's sure and able guidance, the form and character of that Achaian government which for one hundred and forty years, from B. C. 280, to B. C. 146, gave to a large portion of Greece "a measure of freedom, unity, and general good government, which may well atone for the lack of the dazzling glory of the old Athenian democracy," leaving it for our readers to observe the points of likeness and of contrast between it and our own.

And first, the confederation was really a nation, and not a mere league. While the subordinate states of which it was composed had their separate existence and powers, it was itself a unit. Each city had its own local assemblies and magistrates, regulated its domestic concerns without interference, and was sovereign for all purposes not inconsistent with the higher sovereignty of the confederation. But no single city could make peace or war, or enter into any negotiation with foreign states; all power for these purposes was vested in the general assembly, in whose hands the federal sovereignty was placed.

The national officers of government consisted of a Stratēgos, or President and Commander-in-Chief, a Secretary of State (*γραμματεὺς*), and an executive council of ten members (*δამიουργοί*). There were also an Under-General and a General of Cavalry, probably merely military officers. In conjunction with his ministers, the damiurgi, the Stratēgos had the power to summon extraordinary meetings of the popular assembly, and, like an English prime-minister, he could defend his views before the assembly. Though his title was a military one, the only outward symbol of his authority was the national seal, which, on entering upon or retiring from office, he was said to "accept" or "lay down." As military commander, he was supreme, holding undivided command of the armies, and subject only to the criticism of the assembly after the fact. Mr. Freeman suggests that "it may have been the remembrance of the evils inflicted upon Greece" by the "hireling banditti" who formed the armies of Athens in the century after the age of Pericles, "which induced both the Achaian League and the other later Greek commonwealths to fall back upon the old system, and insist upon the union of military and civil powers in the chief of the state"; but this union was certainly an unwise arrangement, as was manifested signally in the case of Aratos, who was almost as bad a general as he was unrivalled in diplomacy. Another defect in the system was the short period for which the Stratēgos held his office, — a single year, — with the prohibition of re-election until after the interval of another year. This latter prohibition was, however, in at least one instance disregarded. If the Stratēgos died in office, his immediate predecessor assumed the post.

The damiurgi seem to have been the federal magistrates of the League in its earlier and looser state, and their powers must have been "thrown somewhat in the shade" on the institution of the office of General. Thirlwall has remarked that their number, ten, corresponds to that of the Achaian townships, as reduced by the loss of Helice and Olenos. This number remained unaltered when the League had widely extended its borders; but the damiurgi, as Mr. Freeman satisfactorily shows, were no longer taken exclusively from the old Achaian towns. They were chosen at the same time with the General, and by the same electors. With them rested the presidency of the assembly, and the duty of putting questions to the vote. Their advice, like that of an executive council, was doubtless taken by the General in all important civil business. Aratos was accompanied by his ten councillors when he went to meet King Antigonos, in the negotiations which prepared the way for his coming into Peloponnesos.

Between the administration and the popular assembly stood the great

council or senate. It consisted of one hundred and twenty unpaid members, who were not improbably appointed, together with the other magistrates, at the spring meeting of the assembly. Theirs were the usual functions of a Greek senate. They were essentially a committee of the assembly, and a meeting of the larger body probably always involved a previous meeting of the smaller. The government brought their proposals before this great council, to be discussed, and perhaps amended, before they were submitted to the final decision of the assembly. Ambassadors were introduced to it before their audience by the assembled nation, and perhaps in some cases they transacted business with it alone. It might often happen, that a summons to an assembly was answered by few besides those citizens who happened to be senators.

The constitution of the assembly was extremely democratic. Every free citizen of any of the cities belonging to the League, if he had attained the age of thirty years, could attend, speak, and vote at its meetings. Yet mob-tyranny was effectually guarded against by the provision which gave to each city but one vote, whether few or many of its citizens were present; moreover, from the more distant towns of the confederacy but a small number of members would be likely to attend, and they of the wealthier class,—an approach in practice to the representative system. To give each city one vote was very well in the little communities of Achaia proper, but certainly unfair to such large cities as Sicyon, Argos, Megalopolis, and Corinth. The assembly held the valuable prerogatives of electing the *Stratēgos* and other magistrates, contracting alliances, and making war or peace. But further than this, its powers were greatly circumscribed. Its sessions—which were held twice a year, in the spring and autumn—were limited to three days. In so short sessions, the initiative of measures must have remained practically in the hands of the government. The course of action was chiefly determined by the President and his cabinet, perhaps with the advice of the senate. At extraordinary meetings of the assembly,—which could be summoned by the government on occasions of special urgency,—that particular business only could be entertained which the assembly had been summoned to decide. Thus, while the assembly was democratic in theory, it was aristocratic in its practical working. Its meetings, too, were chiefly attended by those citizens who were “at once rich enough to bear the cost of the journey, and zealous enough to bear the trouble of it.” This practically aristocratic character attaches to the whole Achaian government. It does not appear that any of the great officers of state were paid for their services; and hence, although there was no property

qualification, they must, as the rule, have been rich men. But, while aristocratic, the government was not illiberal or oligarchical.

For the greater part of the history of the League, the regular meetings of the assembly were held at Aigion, the most important of the old Achaian towns, but insignificant in size when compared with the larger Peloponnesian cities. Mr. Freeman remarks that Aigion was a more suitable capital than any of these, for the same reason that Washington is to be preferred as the seat of government to New York, — it being important, in a federal government, to avoid all liability to undue local influence. In the latter days of the League, Philopoimen carried a measure by which the assembly met in different cities by rotation. It was always the rule that extraordinary meetings could be called at whatever place seemed to the General most suitable in the exigency.

Of the federal courts of justice we know little, except that there were such tribunals, and that the wealthier citizens, of the class which served in the cavalry, were the judges. As regards national taxation, it would seem that requisitions were made upon the separate cities, which raised the sum prescribed, each in its own way. Finally, as regards the military administration, the assembly sometimes required particular cities to furnish particular contingents, and sometimes invested the General with power to summon the whole military force of the nation. Besides the citizen soldiers, mercenaries were employed, who must have been paid by the federal treasury. Out of these two classes the League maintained a small standing army, enough at least to keep federal garrisons in a few important places.

Such are the principal features in the constitution of this renowned League. For a brief period, — but Greece teaches her lessons within narrow limits both of space and of time, — its members, in the language of Polybios, were not only united in friendly alliance, “but also had the same laws, weights, measures, and coins, and moreover the same magistrates, senators, and judges; in short, nearly the whole of Peloponnesos differed in character from a single city in this respect alone, that its inhabitants were not surrounded by the same wall.”

The chief interest of Grecian history clusters around the name of Athens; and the superior fascination of the story of that wondrous city often tempts us to pass by other portions of the old Greek annals with undeserved neglect. Mr. Freeman justly praises Thirlwall, because to him, unlike Grote, “Aratos and Kleomenes are as essential a part of Hellenic story as Themistokles and Perikles.” To use the often-quoted simile of Pausanias, in the old age of Hellas, Achaia sprang up like a new shoot from a dying trunk; and the fresh growth was worthy of its noble stock. Again, in Mr. Freeman's words: —

"It is surely something, to put it on no other ground, to see what was the state of Greece herself in an age in which, though the freshness of her glory was gone, she was still important, — no longer politically dominant, but intellectually more supreme than ever. The Greek history of this time is more like the history of modern times; it is less fresh than that of earlier days, but it is also less uniform, and for that very reason it is more politically instructive. It is no longer merely the history of single cities; it is the history of a complex political world, in which single cities, monarchies, and federations all play their part, just as they do in the European history of later times. It is a time of deeper policy, of more complicated intrigue; an age in which men had lost the vigor and simplicity of youth, but had almost made up for the loss by the gain of a far more enlarged experience." — pp. 225, 226.

The staple of the history of federal Greece, says our author, is formed by "the varying relations between the great Greek monarchy," Macedonia, "and the great Greek confederation," Achaia, "diversified by the strange phenomenon of Ætolia, at once a democratic confederation and an aggressive tyranny, and by the brief but splendid revival of Sparta's greatness." The aim of the Antigonid kings was to reduce Greece under their immediate sovereignty or their indirect influence; that of the Achaian federation to unite the greatest number of Greek cities in the bonds of a free and equal League. We cannot enter into the details of this history, nor trace the fortunes of this first great federation.

"For a hundred and forty years," says Mr. Freeman, "no short space in any nation's life, and a very long space among the few centuries which we call ancient history, the League had given to a larger portion of Greece than any previous age had seen a measure of freedom, unity, and general good government which may well atone for the lack of the dazzling glory of the old Athenian democracy. It was no slight achievement to weld together so many cities into a union which strengthened them against foreign kings and senates, and which yet preserved to them that internal independence which was so dear to the Hellenic mind. It was no slight achievement to keep so many cities for so long a time free alike from foreign garrisons, from domestic mobs, domestic tyrants, and domestic oligarchs. How practically efficient the federal principle was in maintaining the strength and freedom of the nation, is best shown by the bitter hatred which it aroused, first in the Macedonian kings, and then in the Roman Senate. It was no contemptible political system against which so many kings and consuls successively conspired; it was no weak bond which the subtlest of all diplomatic senates expended so many intrigues and stratagems to unloose. . . . The League did its work in its own age by giving Peloponnesos wellnigh a century and a half of freedom; it does its work still by living in the pages of its own great historian as the first attempt on a large scale to reconcile local independence with national strength." — pp. 709, 710.



Upon examining and comparing the original authorities, we have been struck alike with the extent of our author's research, his keen historic insight, the thoroughness of his scholarship, and the trustworthiness of his conclusions. The book is worthy of the high place which Mr. Freeman holds in the estimation of English scholars. He is an examiner in the School of Modern History and Law at Oxford, and, by his writings on various topics of Grecian, Roman, and mediæval history, has given proof of great study and of conscientious handling of facts. His style is clear and forcible, and not wanting in picturesqueness, whenever he is willing to depart from what is necessarily his usual function,—that of a calm, impartial critic of constitutions and laws. Let him complete his great task in the same spirit in which he has begun it, and he will have enriched historical literature with one of its most original works and most valuable treasures.

---

12. — *The Gayworthys: a Story of Threads and Thrums.* By the Author of "Faith Gartney's Girlhood." Boston: Loring, Publisher. 1865. pp. 399.

THIS book appears to have been suggested by a fanciful theory of life, which the author embodies in a somewhat over-figurative preface, and which recurs throughout the story at intervals, like a species of refrain. The theory in question amounts to neither more nor less than this: that life is largely made up of broken threads, of plans arrested in their development, of hopes untimely crushed. This idea is neither very new nor very profound; but the novel formula under which it is shadowed forth on the title-page will probably cause it to strike many well-disposed minds as for the first time. In a story written in the interest of a theory two excellent things are almost certain to be spoiled. It might seem, indeed, that it would be a very small figure of a story that could be injured by a theory like the present one; but when once an author has his dogma at heart, unless he is very much of an artist, it is sure to become obtrusive at the capital moment, and to remind the reader that he is, after all, learning a moral lesson. The slightly ingenious and very superficial figure in which the author embodies her philosophy recurs with a frequency which is truly impertinent.

Our story is organized upon three main threads, which, considering the apparent force of the author's conviction, are on the whole very tenderly handled; inasmuch as, although two of them are at moments drawn so tight that we are fully prepared for the final snap and the quiet triumph of the author's "I told you so," yet only one of them is